

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-22 have been rejected, and claims 11 and 22 have further been objected to due to informalities. By this reply, Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 12, 17, 18, and 22. Additionally, claims 23 and 24 have been added. No claims have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-24 are at issue.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 11 and 22 have been objected to because of informalities. By this amendment, Claims 11 and 22 have been amended, changing the wording “read screen” to “rear screen,” to correct the deficiencies cited by the Examiner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §103

Rejection of 1, 4-10, 12 and 15-21 over Ross et al. in view of Do et al.

In paragraph four of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-10, 12 and 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,540,136 to Ross et al. (“Ross”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,206,284 to Do et al. (“Do”).

The Examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the door as taught by Do to the ATM of Ross, resulting in an invention similar to the claimed invention, and over which the claimed invention would have no patentable distinction. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a front screen attached to the front keypad where the front screen performs a first function and a rear screen attached to the rear keypad. The rear screen is operationally separated from the front screen and performs a second function without interfering with the first function.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite a housing having a front portion and a rear portion. The front portion has a front keypad including a front screen for performing a first function. The rear portion has a rear keypad including a rear screen where the rear

portion is operationally separated from the front portion and performs a second function without interfering with the first function.

Ross fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a front screen performing a first function and a rear screen that is operationally separated from the front screen where the rear screen performs a second function without interfering with the first function.

Similarly, Do fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a front screen performing a first function and a rear screen that is operationally separated from the front screen where the rear screen performs a second function without interfering with the first function.

The law is clear that there must be some reason, suggestion, or motivation found in the prior art whereby a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention would make the modification suggested by the Examiner. "[T]he mere fact that the prior art could be so modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." *In re Laskowski et. al.*, 10 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1397, 1398, (Fed. Cir. 1989), *citing In re Gordon*, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Thus, a disclosure that teaches away from or discourages the making of the claimed invention undermines *prima facie* obviousness. See *In re Sponnoble*, 405 F.2d 578, 587 (C.C.P.A. 1969). A reference teaches away "when a person of ordinary skill, upon reading the reference, would be discouraged from following the path set out in the reference, or would be led in a direction divergent from the path that was taken by the applicant." *In re Gurley*, 27 F.3d 551, 553 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Thus, unless the references suggest the particular combination of elements themselves, they cannot render Applicant's invention obvious. See *In re Mahurkar Patent Litigation*, 831 F. Supp. 1354, 1374, 28 USPQ2d 1801, 1817 (N.D. Ill. 1993).

Both references fail to disclose a front screen performing a first function and a rear screen that is operationally separated from the front screen where the rear screen performs a second function without interfering with the first function. Further, Ross specifically teaches away from the Applicant's claimed invention by disclosing a processor unit that provides output signals to various mechanisms of the cash dispenser, to the displays, and to the **user** and **operator** panels and to the **user** panel receipt printer and the **operator** panel printer (Col. 2, Lines 55-60). As a result, a single processor unit

controls both the user panel and operator panel. As a result, the user panel cannot be operationally separated from the operator panel. Consequently, unlike the present invention, Ross requires that the operator panel is not operationally separated from the front panel.

Claims 4-10 depend from independent claim 1 and thereby require all the limitations of that claim. For the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, these claims are patentably distinct and are neither taught by nor suggested by any of the references cited by the Examiner.

Claims 15-21 depend from independent claim 12 and thereby require all the limitations of that claim. For the reasons stated above with respect to claim 12, these claims are patentably distinct and are neither taught by nor suggested by any of the references cited by the Examiner.

Rejection of 2, 3, 13 and 14 over Ross et al. in view of Do et al. and further in view of Schanz et al.

In paragraph five of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross modified by Do, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,328,206 to Schanz et al. ("Schanz").

Claims 2 and 3 depend from independent claim 1 and thereby require all the limitations of that claim. For the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, these claims are patentably distinct and are neither taught by nor suggested by any of the references cited by the Examiner.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from independent claim 12 and thereby require all the limitations of that claim. For the reasons stated above with respect to claim 12, these claims are patentably distinct and are neither taught by nor suggested by any of the references cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests an early notice of the same. Applicant's attorney invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if any issues can be resolved through a telephone conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/5/04

By: James P. Muraff
James P. Muraff, Reg. No. 39,785
Wallenstein & Wagner, Ltd.
311 S. Wacker Drive, 53rd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6630
312.554.3300

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 C.F.R. § 1.8a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on February 5, 2004.

Gillian Gardner
Gillian Gardner/192694